

SOLICITATION NUMBER TIRNO-04-R-00017  
PART IV - REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS  
SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

M.1	<u>52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)</u> <u>(Reference 17.208)</u> .....	M - 2
M.2	<u>GENERAL</u> .....	M - 2
M.3	<u>BASIS FOR AWARD</u> .....	M - 2
M.4	<u>EVALUATION PROCEDURE</u> .....	M - 3
M.4.1	<u>PROPOSAL PREPARATION COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION</u> .....	M - 4
M.4.2	<u>TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION</u> .....	M - 4
	<u>PROJECT PROFILES</u> .....	M - 4
	<u>MANAGEMENT APPROACH</u> .....	M - 4
	<u>RESUMES</u> .....	M - 4
	<u>ORAL PRESENTATIONS</u> .....	M - 4
	<u>PAST PERFORMANCE</u> .....	M - 5
M.5	<u>OFFEROR DISCUSSIONS</u> .....	M - 5
M.6	<u>EVALUATION SUBJECT AREAS</u> .....	M- 5
M.7	<u>COST AND PRICE PROPOSAL EVALUATION</u> .....	M- 5
M.8	<u>SUBJECT AREAS SCORING</u> .....	M- 6
M.9	<u>OPTIONS</u> .....	M- 6

**SOLICITATION NUMBER TIRNO-04-R-00017**  
**PART IV - REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS**  
**SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**M.1**            **52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)**  
**(Reference 17.208)**

**M.2**            **GENERAL**

Section M sets forth the evaluation factors and criteria for award. To be considered for award, proposals shall be submitted in accordance with the instructions set forth in Section L and meet the mandatory requirements in the Request for Proposal.

The Government intends to evaluate proposals and may award contracts without discussions with Offerors; therefore, each initial offer should contain the Offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if later determined by the Contracting Officer to be necessary.

Each Offeror is expected to submit a complete and acceptable proposal. Proposals shall reflect: (1) the total requirement and scope stated in the Request for Proposals (RFP) and (2) acceptance of requirements, provisions, terms and conditions, or clauses stated in RFP Sections C, D, E, F, G, H, I and K.

Proposals that require a substantial revision or addendum, because of significant omissions or information requested in RFP Section L or because of other deficiencies in (1) and (2) above, may be found unacceptable. Mere restatement of the requirements, or, statements from the Offeror that the proposal is compliant with the RFP without a description of the approaches, techniques, solutions, or processes proposed to satisfy the technical requirements, may be grounds for the Government to assign a low score for those items. Generally speaking, "generic" information may score lower than information "well tailored" to the Government's environment.

As stated in Section L.18, Alternate Proposals will not be accepted.

**M.3**            **BASIS FOR AWARD**

The Government intends to award multiple contracts. Reference Section L.6  
**MULTIPLE AWARDS** .

It is the Government's objective under this solicitation to make a sufficient number of awards so that each task area in Section C has been awarded to at least two (2) Offerors. However, no awards will be made that are not in the best interest of the

**SOLICITATION NUMBER TIRNO-04-R-00017**  
**PART IV - REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS**  
**SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

Government simply to provide coverage in all task areas. This object notwithstanding, the Government is not obligated to award any particular number of contracts as a result of this solicitation.

Each Offeror's technical proposal will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria described in this section. It is important that the Offeror direct the proposal to the criteria and cover each appropriately in response to the solicitation requirements. The Government is more concerned with obtaining superior technical capability than making an award at the lowest price. The evaluation of the Offeror's cost proposal will be of secondary importance to the evaluation of technical proposals in making awards under this solicitation. Although cost is of less importance than the technical factors, taken as a whole, it is a factor and will not be ignored. The importance of cost will increase as the difference in technical proposals decreases. Furthermore, costs will be evaluated on the basis of cost realism and reasonableness.

The evaluation will be conducted on the basis of best value to the Government. Best Value means an acquisition process that results in the most advantageous acquisition decision for the Government and is performed through an integrated assessment and trade-off analysis between technical factors and cost factors.

The Source Selection Authority (SSA) will determine which responsible technically acceptable Offeror(s) provides the best overall value to the Government based on price and other factors considered, and will authorize an award to that Offeror(s). The SSA will not be strictly bound by the ratings. In reaching a decision, the SSA retains the discretion to balance the technical merits of each proposal against the proposed overall price to determine the greatest value to the Government. For example, an award may be made to a lower priced proposal, although its technical rating is lower. As well, if the SSA determines that the technical difference represents a technical advantage and the greatest value to the Government, the SSA may award to such proposal at a higher evaluated cost. The decision will be made at the discretion of the SSA and will depend on the facts and circumstances of the procurement.

Awards will be made to the Offerors whose proposals containing the combination of technical and cost features, offer the best overall value to the Government.

**M.4            EVALUATION PROCEDURE**

Proposals shall be submitted in accordance with the instructions set forth in Section L.9.

**SOLICITATION NUMBER TIRNO-04-R-00017**  
**PART IV - REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS**  
**SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**M.4.1        PROPOSAL PREPARATION COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION**

Prior to the commencement of the technical evaluation, the Contracting Officer will review proposals submitted to determine compliance with the proposal preparation instructions stated in Section L.15. Proposals shall be in compliance with the terms and conditions of the proposed contract and other administrative conditions to receive further consideration.

Refer to Section J, Attachment J.8 and Section L.14.4, IRS CAPABILITY MATURITY MODEL (CMMI®) REQUIREMENTS, for information on obtaining Software Engineering Institute (SEI<sup>sm</sup>) CMMI Level 2 maturity.

**M.4.2        TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION**

- **PROJECT PROFILES** The technical evaluation will begin with an evaluation of the Offeror(s) project profiles submitted by the Offeror (reference Section L.15.3, TECHNICAL SECTION A – PROJECT PROFILES).
- **MANAGEMENT APPROACH** The technical evaluation will continue with an evaluation of the Offeror(s) management approach submitted by the Offeror (reference Section L.15.4, TECHNICAL SECTION B – MANAGEMENT APPROACH).
- **RESUMES** The technical evaluation will continue with an evaluation of the Offeror(s) resumes submitted by the Offeror (reference Section L.15.5, TECHNICAL SECTION C – RESUMES).
- **ORAL PRESENTATIONS** Upon completion of the technical evaluations on Technical Sections A, B, C and past performance (see below) a Competitive Range will be established. Instructions for Oral Presentations will be provided to all Offerors within Competitive Range. All those Offerors within the Competitive Range will be notified by the Contracting Officer and an amendment to the RFP will be issued with Evaluation Factors for award (reference Section L.15.6, TECHNICAL SECTION D – ORAL PRESENTATIONS).
- **PAST PERFORMANCE** Past performance may be evaluated based on the references submitted in the Project Profiles, information obtained from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) performance database, both favorable and unfavorable, and other government resources that are available prior to

**SOLICITATION NUMBER TIRNO-04-R-00017**  
**PART IV - REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS**  
**SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

competitive range being determined. Past Performance evaluation shall encompass a review of projects relevant to size and scope to work anticipated under TIPSS-3.

**M.5            OFFEROR DISCUSSIONS**

The Government may hold discussions with Offerors determined to be within the competitive range based on an integrated assessment and trade-off analysis between technical factors and cost factors.

**M.6            EVALUATION SUBJECT AREAS**

Each proposal will be evaluated to determine the Offeror's demonstrated ability to provide information technology support services within the framework of the scope of this acquisition.

The Technical Proposal will be an important factor in the selection of the Offeror, and shall be specific and complete. Each Offeror's Technical Proposal shall present the information necessary to provide a basis for evaluation by the Government of the Offeror's Project Profiles, Management Approach, Resumes, and Oral Presentation.

**M.7            COST AND PRICE PROPOSAL EVALUATION**

The Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF) portion of Section B will be evaluated in accordance with FAR Part 15.404-(c) cost analysis. The Time and Materials (T&M) Labor Rates will be evaluated in accordance with FAR Part 15.404-1 (b) price analysis. Cost/Price will be evaluated, but will not be assigned numerical weight or scored.

The Cost-Plus-Fix-Fee (CPFF) portion and the Time and Materials (T&M) Labor Hour Rates portion will be evaluated yearly and as a Grand Total. See Section B.2 thru B.6 CPFF Services and T&M Hourly Labor Rates and Section L.16.1 COST/PRICE PROPOSAL.

**SOLICITATION NUMBER TIRNO-04-R-00017**  
**PART IV - REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS**  
**SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**M.8**            **SUBJECT AREA SCORING**

Each proposal will be evaluated in the following areas which are listed in descending order of importance:

- Management Approach
- Resumes
- Oral Presentations (after competitive range is determined)
- Project Profiles
- Past Performance
- Cost (Not Scored)

**M.9**            **OPTIONS**

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s)

(a) For award purposes, in addition to an Offeror's response to the basic requirement, the Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical and cost response to all contract options. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the options. Offers containing any charges for failure to exercise any option will be rejected.

(b) Selection of an Offer(s) will be made on the basis of the most advantageous alternative to the Government provided that the contract costs reasonably represent the value of bona fide requirements for each fiscal year.

(End Of Section)